A U M

The subtle self is to be known by thought alone; for every thought of men is interwoven with the senses, and when thought is purified, then the self arises.

—*Mundaka Upanishad*

THEOSOPHY

Vol. XXXV February, 1947 No. 4

MINOR CURRENTS

THE theosophical movement is essentially a free endeavor of souls. Moral action is the only contribution that can be made to that movement, and only the free choice of the individual gives moral force to his actions. It is an endeavor of *souls* because the purposes of the movement are germane and natural to the soul alone. The real activity of the theosophical movement takes place on inner planes of being. It does not depend upon conditions, times, places or circumstances. But it does depend upon agents.

The nature of these moral agents—pre-eminently the Adepts—is illumined by "their own reply," familiar to students of *The Ocean of Theosophy*. Freedom, it seems, is necessary and natural to those who do the most to make Theosophy work in and for the world: The precise condition of their success is that they "should never be supervised or obstructed." Working under the natural limitations imposed upon them by cyclic and karmic law, they cannot counteract the general drift of the world's cosmic relations; as they say, "We, borne along the mighty tide, can only modify and direct some of its minor currents."

The elder brothers themselves apparently can not admit interference. Thus they would naturally expect of others, as of themselves, the capacity to sustain a self-directed, self-evolved course of action, and the moral intelligence to insure that the course pursued shall be humanitarian, both in motive and effect. "Minor currents," therefore, are not energized by psychic slaves, who are influenced (even for their own good or the good of mankind as a whole) by invisible dictators. "Pushing and pulling" is incompatible with beings who have individually achieved the status of perfected men. "Directing" those who are preparing to "take an active part in the government of the natural order of things" does not imply that the

Adepts *control,* by the superior force of their will-power, the activity of their weaker and less progressed brothers. The greatest Beings in evolution would not, even if they could, interfere with karma or soul integrity. The "companions" are *not* mediums. Rather, they move, in their degree, in the mental atmosphere of the Teachers. Since the mind is not of a tangible nature, distance does not divide it from the subject of its contemplation, and as H. P. Blavatsky says in the *Key to Theosophy,* "the only difference that can exist between two minds is a difference of STATE." There is a wise abyss between mediumship and Adeptship, between psychic influence passively accepted and mental communion consciously established, between willless victims of a "spirit control" and the protected free will of a "minor current."

Have directions been provided in the teachings of Theosophy for setting up minor currents? For developing those mortals who may be overshadowed occasionally by Beings from higher worlds? It is for the individual theosophist to answer these questions in himself, and to none other. The endeavor, if attempted, must necessarily be part of the evolution of the *self-moving* soul, and even the opportunity for the enterprise must be self-perceived.

Certain general features are nevertheless clear. Those who may be regarded as of the "minor currents" must have oriented their lives with the major objectives of the theosophical movement. They are those whose work for humanity requires simply *adjustment* from time to time to render direction true, those whose willingness to modify their course out of regard for the end in view makes them naturally receptive to intimations and intuitions conveying needed suggestions. Concerned with the great want of brotherhood, tolerance, and a respect for the dignity of man, such individuals would gradually approach, with more and more concentration, the state of mind constantly maintained by the Adept. A free moral agent so far transcends personal concerns that, in the words of Synesius, he "pays attention to and affects countless multitudes of men." In this connection, it is not difficult to see the relevance of H.P.B.'s declaration—by no means the only one of its kind—that "There is no room for *personalities* in a work like ours; and all must be ready, as the Founders are, if needs be, for the car of Jaggennâth to crush them *individually* for *the good of all.*"

INAUGURAL ADDRESS

[As a matter of theosophical history, students will be interested to read the first address delivered to the Theosophical Society, which was inaugurated on November 17, 1875, in New York City. The address was delivered by Col. H. S. Olcott, first President of the Society, who maintained his devotion to the work until the end of his days. This document, Col. Olcott wrote in *Old Diary Leaves,* "reads a bit foolish after seventeen years of hard experience," but his disillusionment with it is not altogether justified. The original objects of the T.S. are clearly given; the emphasis on spiritualism came naturally because the majority of the early members were spiritualists, and H. P. Blavatsky's first work was with that movement; and throughout the address breathes the fearless spirit of moral pioneering. Olcott's strong avowal of his own devotion to the Society might seem overdrawn, now that seventy years have intervened—except for the fact that, however much his limitations narrowed the scope of his service, Col. Olcott did stand firm in the work *as he conceived it.* Gratitude for his labors can never be denied him by any loyal theosophist, as it was not by H.P.B., by W.Q.J., or by the Masters.—Eds. THEOSOPHY.]

IN future times, when the impartial historian shall write an account of the progress of religious ideas in the present century, the formation of this Theosophical Society, whose first meeting under its formal declaration of principles we are now attending, will not pass unnoticed. This much is certain. The bare announcement of the intended inauguration of such a movement attracted attention, and caused no little discussion in the secular as well as the religious press. It has sounded in the ears of some of the leaders of the contending forces of theology and science, like the distant blast of a trumpet to the struggling armies in a battle. The note is faint as yet, and indicates neither the strength nor purposes of the body approaching. For either side, it may mean a reinforcement that will help turn the tide of victory; it may herald only the gathering of neutrals to watch events; or it may threaten the discomfiture and disarmament of both antagonists.

From what little has been said in its behalf, it is not yet clear to the public how this "new departure" should be regarded. Neither church nor college knows whether to adopt a policy of denunciation, misrepresentation, contumely, or amity. By some secular journals it is patronizingly encouraged as likely to "enliven a prosaic age with exhibitions of mediaeval tricks of sorcery," while others denounce

it as the forerunner of a relapse into "the worst forms of fetishism." The spiritualists began, a few weeks ago, with voluminous and angry protests against its promoters, as seeking to supplant the prevalent democratic relations with the other world by an aristocratic esoterism, and even now, while they seem to be watching our next move with the greatest interest, their press teems with defamatory criticisms. Neither of the religious sects has definitively committed itself, although our preliminary advances have been noticed in a guarded way in some of their organs.

Such being the state of the case at the very outset of our movement, before one blow has been struck, am I not warranted in repeating the statement that in the coming time it is inevitable that the birth of this society of ours must be considered as a factor in the problem which the historian will be required to solve?

The present small number of its members is not to be considered at all in judging of its probable career. Eighteen hundred and forty odd years ago, the whole Christian Church could be contained within a Galilean fisherman's hut, and yet it now embraces one hundred and twenty millions of people within its communion; and twelve centuries ago, the only believer in Islamism, which now counts two hundred and fifty million devotees, bestrode a camel and dreamed dreams.

No, it is not a question of numbers how great an effect this society will have upon religious thought—I will go further, and say the science and philosophy—of the age: great events sometimes come from far more modest beginnings. I need not occupy time in quoting examples which will occur to every one of you in corroboration of my point. Nor is it a question of endowment funds and income any more than one of numerous members: the propagandist disciples sent out by Jesus went barefoot, ill clothed, and without purse or scrip.

What is it, then, which makes me say what in deepest seriousness and a full knowledge of its truth I have said? What is it that makes me not only content but proud to stand for the brief moment as the mouth-piece and figure-head of this movement, risking abuse, misrepresentation, and every vile assault? It is the fact that in my soul I feel that behind us, behind our little band, behind our feeble new-born organization, there gathers a MIGHTY POWER that nothing can withstand—the power of truth! Because I feel that we are only the advance-guard, holding the pass until the main body shall come up. Because I feel that we are enlisted in a holy cause, and

that truth, now as always, is mighty and will prevail. Because I see around us a multitude of people of many different creeds worshipping, through sheer ignorance, shams and effete superstitions, and who are only waiting to be shown the audacity and dishonesty of their spiritual guides to call them to account, and begin to think for themselves. Because I feel, as a sincere theosophist, that we shall be able to give to science such evidences of the truth of the ancient philosophy and the comprehensiveness of ancient science, that her drift towards atheism will be arrested, and our chemists will, as Madame Blavatsky expresses it, "set to work to learn a new alphabet of Science on the lap of Mother Nature."

As a believer in theosophy, theoretical and practical, I personally am confident that this society will be the means of furnishing such unanswerable proofs of the immortality of the soul, that none but fools will doubt. I believe that the time will come when men will be as ashamed of ever having advocated atheism in any of its forms, as, thirty years hence, they will be of ever having owned a slave or countenanced human slavery.

Look back the few, the very few, years to the time when William Lloyd Garrison was led through Boston streets with a rope around his neck. Compare that with the present state of the Slavery Question, and then tell me what may *not* a few earnest, determined, unselfish persons do. Why, in 1859, I myself went, at the risk of my life, to report for the New-York *Tribune* the hanging of John Brown; and in 1857, while I was visiting Senator Hammond, of South Carolina, solely in my character of a student of scientific agriculture, and having nothing whatever to do with politics, an Augusta paper advised my commission to jail because I wrote for the *Tribune,* although only upon agriculture. Having passed through such experiences, and seen so complete a reversal of conditions within the space of less than a score of years, I feel that neither I nor this society incurs any great danger by displaying a little moral courage in so good a cause. Let the future take care of itself; it is for us to so shape the present as to make it beget what we desire and what will bring honor upon us. If we are true to each other and true to ourselves, we shall surmount every obstacle, vanquish every foe, and attain what we are all in search of, the peace of mind which comes of absolute knowledge. If we are divided, irresolute, temporizing, jesuitical, we shall fail as a society to do what is now clearly within our reach; and future years will doubtless see us bewailing the loss of such a golden opportunity as comes to few persons in a succession of centuries.

But if this society were to dissolve within one year, we should not have lived in vain. To-day is our own; to-morrow may be; but yesterday is gone forever. In the economy of nature, an impulse, however slight, once given to matter is eternal; and an act once performed, its consequences, be they great or small, must be worked out sooner or later. The passing caprice of a woman may change the destiny of nations; the speaking of a word in the mountains brings a crushing avalanche upon the hamlet that lies at their feet; the turning of a man's footsteps to the right or left, to avoid a stone, or chase a butterfly, or gratify it matters not what idle whim, may alter his whole life, and, directly or indirectly, result in momentous consequences to a world.

About us we see the people struggling blindly to emancipate their thought from ecclesiastical despotism—without seeing more than a faint glimmer of light in the whole black horizon of their religious ideas. They struggle from an irrepressible desire to be free from shackles which bind their limping reason after their volant intuitions have outgrown them. Upon the one side, the philosophical chemists invite them to an apotheosis of matter; upon the other, the spiritualists fling open the painted doors of their "angel world." The clergy hold them back and hiss warnings and anathemas in their ear. They waver, uncertain which way to go. Heirs to the spiritual longings of the race, they shrink back from the prospect of annihilation, which, in their own case, when life's burden presses heavily, may not always seem unwelcome, but which was never meant for those near and dear ones who have died in their youth and purity, and left behind a sweet fragrance when the alabaster box was broken and they passed behind the Veil of Isis.

But when they turn to spiritualism for comfort and conviction, they encounter such a barrier of imposture, tricky mediums, lying spirits, and revolting social theories, that they recoil with loathing; secretly lamenting the necessity which compels them to do it. They count among their acquaintance, perhaps, many persons of irreproachable character who can testify to the identification of departed friends and count themselves spiritualists; but they see these very friends attending their churches as before, abstaining from spiritualist meetings, and taking the spiritualist papers secretly. When they ask why this is so, the universal reply is that so many immoral people have fastened upon the cause, and mediums are being so constantly detected in trickery, that it is almost disreputable to be an open and avowed spiritualist. The organs of the class apologize

for cheating mediums, demanding that sceptics shall overlook the nine instances of fraud and consider the one genuine phenomenon; forgetting that it requires blunt nerves and a strong purpose to dig to the bottom of a muck-heap for the chance of finding something of value there.

The protestant sects began with the fatal assumption that an infallible and inspired Bible will bear the test of reason, and so forecast their own doom; for the analytical power of reason is bounded only by the limits of ascertained truth, and fresh discoveries are daily made among the remains of antiquity which attack the very foundations upon which the whole scheme of Christianity is based. The most audacious explorers in science are recruits from protestantism, and that would-be mistress of our conscience is stabbed by her own children. The Catholic Church having erected a theocracy upon the ruins of the ancient faiths, and stolen not only their allegories but their very exoteric symbolism and revamped them for their own use, is gathering her forces for the struggle that she knows too well is close at hand, and that will be mortal. Enraged at the progress of the age, which has extinguished her penal fires, destroyed her torture-chambers, blunted her axe, and made it impossible for her to rebathe her hands in human blood, she is working silently, cunningly, and with intense eagerness to regain her lost supremacy. What this undercurrent is we may see in the disgraceful Orange Riot of 1872; the recent conviction of poor Laymarie, in Paris; and the affair of Guibord, in Montreal, whose body has just been buried in a ton of Portland cement and under the escort of thirteen hundred armed police, infantry and artillery, to protect it from the rage of the Catholics, because Guibord belonged to a society which admitted liberal books into its library! We may also see the secret machinations of the church in the perversions to its communion; the establishment of schools, colleges, convents, monasteries; the schemes to romanize a portion of our common schools; the building of costly cathedrals; and the erection of parishes into bishoprics, and bishoprics into archiepiscopal sees.

Upon what does this church or any other ecclesiastical hierarchy stand, but upon the congenital longing of man for an immortal existence; the obscurity of our view of the other world by reason of intervening matter; and the urgency of material wants, which oblige us to accept the intervention of a select class of spiritual guides and expounders, or go without spiritual nourishment other than such as we can pick up beside the dusty road along which we trudge from youth to old age?

If the founders of this society are true to themselves, they will set to work to study the religious question from the standpoint of the ancient peoples, gather together their wisdom, verify their alleged theosophic discoveries (I say *alleged,* as president of a non-committal society of investigation: as an individual, I should omit that word, and give full credit where it is due) and contribute to the common fund whatever is of common interest. If there be any who have begun without counting the cost; if there be any who think to pervert this body to sectarian or any other narrow, selfish ends; if there be any cowards, who wish to meet with us in secret and revile us in public; if there be any who begin with the hope or expectation of making every thing bend to their preconceived notions, regardless of the evidence; if there be any who, in subscribing to the broad and manly principle enunciated in the by-laws, that we will discover all we can about *all* the laws of nature, do so with a mental reservation that they will back out if any pet theory, or creed, or interest is endangered;—if there be any such, I pray them, in all kindness, to withdraw now, when they can do so without hard words or hard feelings. For, if I understand the spirit of this society, it consecrates itself to the intrepid and conscientious study of truth, and binds itself, individually as collectively, to suffer *nothing* to stand in the way. As for me—poor, weak man, honored far beyond my deserts in my election to this place of honor and of danger—I can only say that, come well come ill, my heart, my soul, my mind, and my strength are pledged to this cause, and I shall stand fast while I have a breath of life in me, though all others shall retire and leave me to stand alone. But I shall not be alone, nor will the Theosophical Society be alone. Even now branch societies are projected in this country. Our organization has been noticed in England, and I am told that an article upon the subject is about to appear in one of the greatest of the quarterlies. Whether it shall be couched in friendly or hostile spirit matters little; our protest and challenge will be announced, and we may safely leave the rest to the natural order of events. *(To be concluded.)*

Theosophy is essentially unsectarian, and work for it forms the entrance to the Inner life. But none can enter there save the man himself in the highest and truest spirit of Brotherhood, and any other attempt at entrance will either be futile or he will lie blasted at the threshold. —H.P.B.

THE METAPHYSICS OF PREJUDICE

Polarity is universal, but the polariser lies in our own consciousness.
—H. P. BLAVATSKY

THE declension of metaphysical thought in contemporary life runs parallel with the degradation, to which attention was called by H. P. Blavatsky in the last century, of "the pure ideal of cosmic creation into an emblem of mere human reproduction and sexual functions." In one of the most recent philosophical works (*The Nature of Metaphysical Thinking,* by Dorothy M. Emmet, 1945) we are told that while a metaphysical thinker may try to see life steadily, he cannot see it as a whole: "He can only express what he grasps in the perspective of experience." If we should ask how we are to define experience, a provisional reply is given that it is "the sum-total of appearances, feelings, impulses, together with the thinking which seeks to find or create some sort of significant order in these." All this would appear to be far removed from a philosophy of being and knowing, or from anything remotely resembling transcendental thought. We are, indeed, anchored firmly to the conception of metaphysical theory as affecting "the creation of an intellectual form," and as being prevented from being a merely subjective impression by the need to achieve some measure of comprehensiveness (*ibid*). Whatever may be the implications of the term "subjective impression" (which would seem to be aimed at excluding anything savouring of mysticism), it may at least be said that, in this interpretation of modern thought, we have left behind us the view entertained by esoteric philosophy—that there are metaphysical causes, "the chief of which is the desire to exist, an outcome of Nidana and Maya," and that both science and religion "ignore the metaphysical abstractions which are the only conceivable cause of physical concretions" (*The Secret Doctrine,* I, 44-5).

Some part of the cause of the descent from the transcendental is not difficult to seek. Apart from the general tenor of cyclical law, "European" language has not found the words to express the fundamental thought of occult metaphysics. Where is the contemporary thinker who is prepared to maintain that "Spirit and Matter are two FACETS of the unthinkable UNITY, their apparently contrasted aspects depending, (*a*) on the various degrees of differentiation of the latter, and (*b*) on the grades of consciousness attained by man himself"? (*S.D.* I, 543.) And yet, here are the *alpha* and *omega* of all metaphysical theory. What, now, of its application to the phenomena of prejudice in the world of thought and feeling?

Of the reality of prejudice as a vital factor in man's cultural environment there can be no doubt. The history of social change, in one of its aspects, is a monument to the invincibility of ignorant judgments. Because the Theosophical Movement, as originally conceived by the Founders, was one of the most important activities of the age, it met (and still meets) with sustained and virulent opposition from entrenched interests. It threatened "the very life of most of the time-honoured humbug, prejudices, and social evils of the day," and, as a consequence, every weapon of bigotry and prejudice was turned against it. It cannot, therefore, be without interest to ascertain what can be said of the place of prejudice in the ordinary processes of thought, as these may be known to us. Ignoring for the moment particular manifestations of bias and prepossessions, how are we to relate prejudice to thinking?

Essentially, we may consider that the hallmark of prejudice is irrelevancy to the function generally assumed to be served by thinking itself, namely, the ascertainment of truth. The inapplicability may be brought about by the introduction of feelings, impulses, or motives, into the current of thought. As a result, attention may be diverted from the strict objective of our thinking as that may be directed to any subject. Or suggestion, having its source in already accepted views, may colour and distort the clear perception of truth. Finally, judgment may be warped by the loss of right focus in a non-disinterested nature. Impatience, timidity (a different thing from true humility), and sheer sloth, may also contribute to bad thinking. We are concerned here, however, with prejudice in itself, and some of the varying forms which it assumes. As always, it is useful for the student of these matters to begin with a study of his own nature, and a good exercise is to estimate the elements in our thinking which tend to produce a liking (as distinct from a conviction) for one opinion rather than another. By so doing, a large territory is brought into view—a medley of past associations and present environmental factors, which, when sorted out, will give some reality to the perhaps hitherto theoretical opinions held of the difficult subjects of the *skandhas* and the *nidanas*!

When we read with indignation, for instance, of the activities of "pressure-groups" and their influence on national polity, would not it be well to look closer and weigh judiciously the existence in our own feeling-nature of the impulse of self-preservation, the motive of self-interest, and the inclination to self-assertion? For these simple feelings are at the very root of much that is deplored in national and world affairs. Nor can many of us pride ourselves on freedom

from that resentment which is so often the prelude, when not the accompaniment, of prejudiced thinking. Such a sense of indignation is to be seen in full flower in the reaction of conventional opinion to the new orientation brought by H. P. Blavatsky to the thought of the nineteenth century. Too few there are who share Socrates' opinion that the greatest service one man can do for another is to show him where he has been wrong, and to help to put him right.

Even if we put on one side the self-regarding propensities of our emotional nature, we are still largely creatures of habit, and our theosophical interests are not, in themselves, any guarantee of freedom from the classification of the dogmatists. Without particularizing, do we always and everywhere welcome questions about "the evidences of the genuineness" of our ideas? Are we sometimes disposed to attribute to a theosophical book additional value because of pretended authority (*S.D.* I, xix), and to look for "infallibility" as an escape from the use of reason? Are we apt to be content with something less than the recognition of the whole truth, to be gratified with partial truths which may possess special appeal for us? And are we guilty, on occasion, of the propensity to hide our real beliefs "in deference to popular prejudices"? These are pertinent questions which each student must answer "in the silence and sanctified solitude" of his soul. For most of us, it is too soon to boast of freedom from human infirmities! In the perennial conflict between evidence and belief, there is always room for the logic of facts. The aphorism of the author of *The Analogy of Religion* (Bishop Butler) is cogent: "Things are what they are, and the consequences will be what they will be. Why, then, should we wish to be deceived?"

Another element in our thinking which has a prejudicial effect is sentimentality. Professor G. C. Field classes this, together with mistaken notions of benevolence, among the emotional tendencies directed towards other people which quite definitely make for prejudice. It is largely a temperamental defect, built up by the common habit of accepting too readily what we are told without question or criticism. We are all more or less susceptible to the propaganda of words and slogans, aimed so often at the paralysis of what reasoning faculties we may have cultivated. Thereupon, defeated thought takes refuge in the emotional levels of our personal nature as an over-sensitivity to a mass suggestion which vitiates effective action. Sentimentality is antithetical to compassion. In this connection, it is interesting to observe how its pitfalls were avoided by the Founders of the Theosophical Movement in 1875, in their drafting of the three Objects, with special emphasis upon Universal Brotherhood.

The term "Universal Brotherhood of Humanity" is saved from the dangers of sentimentality in the context by defining its application "without distinction of race, creed, sex, caste, or color," and by bringing to the support of the universalization of the concept all the advantages to be derived from the study of ancient and modern religions, philosophies, and sciences, and from the investigation of the unexplained laws of nature and the psychical powers latent in man. As Professor Field reminds us, in another relationship: "The impartial and disinterested search for truth has a very corroding influence on prejudice, which may work slowly, but is none the less very deadly." If a very powerful motive be needed to overcome conventional thought and distorted judgments, it is to be found in the unceasing effort to promulgate the truth of Universal Brotherhood in a world which science has made one materially.

There is an aspect of Prejudice, however, which has a deeper metaphysical import than we may find assigned to it as a rule in general philosophical works. "To become a genuine spiritual entity," wrote H. P. Blavatsky, "man must first *create* himself anew, so to speak—*i. e.*, thoroughly eliminate from his mind and spirit, not only the dominating influence of selfishness and other impurity, but also the infection of superstition and prejudice." (*Isis Unveiled,* I, 39.) This infection or contagion is a very real communication of the disease of prejudice by "atmosphere" as well as by "contact," and the needful creative effort is impossible in the fever-laden swamp of Sciolism—"superficial learning, vain, narrow-minded, and selfishly bigoted." Unfortunately, we are all affected to some degree by "that powerful current of magnetism which emanates from ideas as well as from physical bodies" (*I.U.* I, 39). The dark circle of prejudice is a potent world force, and, as is the case with that simplest form of looking for reward which is called ambition, "men of intelligence and power are led away from their higher possibilities by it continually." Too little remembered is the wise counsel of Narada:

> Never utter these words: "I do not know this—therefore, it is false." One must study to know, know to understand, and understand to judge.

In these days of the aftermath of two World Wars in one generation, the word Freedom is on everybody's lips as the expression of a supposed New Order. Nobody quite knows what it means. But, can it mean anything at all, unless our minds are clarified, more especially from that fog of selfishness in which we are blinded to the truth by personal interest, and we blunder into a quagmire of vain imaginings? A truer diagnosis of the Age was made by H. P. Bla-

vatsky in "The Dual Aspect of Wisdom": "This is the age which, although proclaimed as one of physical and moral freedom, is in truth the age of the most ferocious moral and mental slavery, the like of which was never known before." The fact is that we are heirs of a spirit of unbelief, in the sense that we are prepared to deny even the possibility of attaining a knowledge of truth.

If we are asked for an apt illustration of the influence of prejudice on human affairs, it is afforded by a study of racial superstition. In 1859 there appeared *The Origin of Species,* by Charles Darwin, an event whose reverberations still beat about our ears. In the same year there was founded in Paris by Paul Broca the first Anthropological Society. Since that time, anthropology has become in the main, under the powerful impetus of the Darwinian theory of evolution, a science of measurement of parts of the human body, in order to find the common or differentiating characteristics of races. This measuring process reached its culmination, perhaps, about 1900, when A. von Török exacted 5,000 measurements from a single skull. All the derivative racial theories, however, were vitiated by Darwinism.

The result was (as shown by Mr. Jacques Barzun in *Race: A Study in Modern Superstition,* 1938) that between 1870 and 1914, both science and evolutionary theory "were conferring certainty upon the most diverse fanaticisms." Natural selection was diverted into channels glorifying racial supremacy, and the survival of the fittest was put to the arbitrament of war. Prejudice made short work of the disinterested research of the honest scientist, and there were always those who, themselves diseased, were ready to contaminate the minds of their fellowmen with rationalizations of aggression and racial snobbery. The karma of ignoring *Isis Unveiled* (1877) and *The Secret Doctrine* (1888) still lies heavily across a broken world. Not yet is it seen that "mankind is of one 'blood,' but not of the same essence." Of the bigotry which rejected reference to antiquity, the question of Eugenius Philalethes (Thomas Vaughan) might well have been asked: "Is it imaginable that they who are fools in nature should be wise in books, which are testimonies unto nature?"

Prejudice being recognized, then, as a metaphysical force ever operative under the conditions of life as we now know it, how may we proceed in the hope of freeing ourselves, and thus the world, from its pernicious effects? Can we, in respect of modern superstition and prejudice, hope to become members of the *academeia,* and, as Plato did with the popular magic of his day, develop—

> the exaggerated notions of the time into rational theories and metaphysical conceptions . . . satisfactory in the highest degree to those who apprehend the existence of that higher faculty of insight or intuition, as affording a criterion for ascertaining truth (*I. U.* I, xiii).

An affirmative answer is possible if we accept, and endeavour to realize in our own persons, the teaching that the nous, spirit, or the rational soul, possesses a nature "capable of beholding the eternal realities." We must put ourselves under the obligation of seeking truth for its own sake, and of pursuing knowledge for the lasting benefit it may confer on others, not on ourselves. We must repudiate the urge that inevitably overtakes the student, at some stage of his studies, of seeking to pose as an authority in his own right. Weighing the advantages against the evils of modern civilization, with cool and disinterested judgment, we should not too readily fall victims to the world's scale of values, and thus be known as slaves of its likes and dislikes. We will remember the observation of Jean Paul Richter (1763-1825): "I have heard that some philosophers in seeking for Truth, to pay homage to her, have seen their own image in the water, and adored it instead."

This being premised, we shall enter with confidence upon the task of eliminating the selfishness of the personality, as constituting an impassable wall between the Truth and ourselves. A determined and sincere effort towards this achievement will convince us that terrestrial perceptions have to be superseded in due time by the development of an inner faculty of perception which will penetrate the illusions that encompass the pavilion of Truth. H. P. Blavatsky long ago warned her students against the voice of the purely physiological mind, whose words they were bidden to deaden ("What is Truth?" *Lucifer,* February, 1888). On the physical plane, she asked them to use their "mental polariscope" in order to analyze the properties of each ray of the Sun of Truth, and to choose the purest. On the spiritual plane, there was always before us the work, "in dead earnest," of developing the higher nature.

The whole effort of the Theosophical Movement, as she visualized it, was in the direction of divesting the human soul of the dark garments of illusion. It had, and has, its exoteric and esoteric aspects. The former, rightly pursued, will give us a criterion of truth amidst the conflicting claims of contemporary thought. The latter, correctly understood, will lead us to that self-knowledge which will enable the personal man and his sphere of operations to be viewed with impartiality. For intelligence, whose nature is knowledge, is always equitable.

STUDIES IN KARMA

The Survival of the Fittest

TO posit Karma is to assert that the laws of man's internal being will in time operate to establish the real "conditions of existence" for the individual. Further, that the desire of men to construct a civilization built upon material, rather than spiritual, "goods" will ultimately be frustrated by the fact that civilization—which must of necessity be a growth in human instead of animalistic attributes—can neither be successfully established nor maintained without attention to man's moral interdependence with others. This is the fundamental limitation, from a theosophical view, upon the "freedom of the will." In practical terms, and in Kali Yuga, this means that only the *morally* fit can survive in the life of the soul, for those who live as creatures of the jungle must die in the same way.

A "materialistic" civilization rises from the belief that the fittest are those who wield the greatest temporal power, and that those who wield the greatest power will survive. The attainment of sufficient "survival power" makes strenuous demands upon all of the vital energies of the human beings concerned, producing the familiar characteristics of the modern militarized state. It is necessary to examine this broad, social consequence of modern materialism in some detail, for it is rapidly becoming the most obvious focus for the play of the collective karma of the twentieth century. The peoples who become the "strongest" must devote themselves to protecting their material guarantees of strength, and this, in the course of Nationalistic history, has always meant vigilant and effective militarization. In the process, it is necessary for the individual citizen to relinquish a large portion of individual judgment in the interest of "military necessity"—else he weakens the military power upon which he depends. Therefore the most important question which can be asked the modern man who has sought security or protection through organized might, is whether or not he can have a life of moral growth while supporting a highly-organized form of society which tends to make all crucial decisions *for* him.

This problem is objectively focussed in modern warfare, because social opinion does not encourage the individual to decide *on moral grounds* whether or not he should join an army or pay taxes for the maintenance of military institutions. The individual has a certain specious type of choice—he can refuse the military, but he cannot do so and retain a respectable place in society. And unless he is dedi-

cated to a philosophy which gives genuine pre-eminence to spiritual realities, he will think his "place in society" is his only refuge. He can refuse to join a politically-inclined trade union because he does not believe in the politics of the organization, but he cannot do so, if the "closed shop" policy prevails, and continue to practice his chosen trade.

Thus the nature of Kali Yuga—particularly its objectivized materialism in the form of modern institutions—would seem to make it inevitable that the free individual, at some point or other, must either renounce a respectable position in society or renounce his opportunity to think and choose for himself. From this dilemma, though it will not come clearly to many, perhaps, for thousands of years, there can logically be no escape.

The materialization of the idea of "security" is a basic element in the nature of organizations. Hence there is less morality in organizations than in individuals. An army is more brutal than any of its units, for a man will do many things as a soldier which he would never contemplate otherwise. The reason for this is simply that any organization formed for the production of external security receives a disproportionate impulsion from the more animalistic, "lower" nature of man. In the end, institutions will either sap all moral strength from the individual, or be transcended by him.

If the recent and most horrible of all wars had been fought by men who entered the ranks of the various armies because they believed, by virtue of free judgment, that such a course was designed to help the life of soul, no war would have been fought. German military might depended upon fear—fear that one's security and livelihood would be endangered if the party in power were not obeyed. Of this political materialism the German Nazi was an extreme, though not a unique, example. He was not alone in his failure to perceive that though war begins with the plea for attaining greater external security, the final development of its technique brings about the complete destruction of security—the most striking illustration of this eventuality being the atom bomb.

The seeking of all security through external protection is, however, a tendency found elsewhere than in preparation for national defense. Consider the strange "Karma" of the excessively wealthy. Years spent in amassing wealth, years given over to the problem of protecting whatever of wealth is acquired, until finally the too-wealthy man sits like a spider in the middle of a gigantic web representing his "interests" and concerns, and though he knows it not

except as a vague feeling of dissatisfaction, he himself is securely caught in the web. Every move made by another man which appears to threaten one of his properties calls forth an automatic response from him—conferences with lawyers and banks—a tedious and often vicious defensive action. In thus *re*-acting, the wealthy man becomes as much an automaton as the conscript in the army.

Turn instead to the supposed opposite pole of the social situation—leaders of large labor organizations. While they profess to represent a necessary phase of the social struggle and while some are bona fide reformers by nature and by action, how often do the lieutenants and captains of labor's armies think for themselves? To what degree are they wedded completely to the preservation of an organization which many outsiders (and some insiders) continually threaten to destroy, in their bids for power? All too often they, like the "capitalist" and the army man, think in terms of the organization, not in terms of what is humanly better, or best.

The pattern is clear enough. Whenever a man devotes his concentrated life-energy to a career based upon a desire to find security by external means—whether it be by armies, by a financial empire, or by an extremely powerful trade union, he increases the attention which people will pay to that sort of ideal—makes the competition, in a sense, more difficult for himself. Others are struck by his example, and the example is dangerous.

This, in fact, is exactly what seems to have happened during a whole cycle of civilization. Men, following the example of a struggle for survival on *animal* terms, constantly create bigger and more de-humanized institutions. This is *psychologically* why armies and wars have grown larger and larger; why General Motors is bigger than any of the fabulous financial structures built in the days of great personal industrial achievement. And it is also why the huge trade unions, originally designed to fight a necessary war for the right of collective bargaining, have left the individual workman far behind—just as did long ago the Republican and Democratic parties in the political sphere. In fact the unions, more than parties, have imposed a regimen in part dependent upon the fear of many of their members. Out of just such a combination of psychological elements was that terrible scourge, Nazism, created. The State became the object of veneration, the object to be feared, and the source from which one hoped to gain sufficient security. (Germany, it should be remembered, literally starved following the last war—just as literally as she is starving today. Security *did* seem worth a premium payment!)

The point at which Karma is most immediately invoked is when the example of the victors in armed or financial or organizational warfare indicates, to all those who suffer from lack of similar success, that security can be achieved only through bitter struggle, *through highly organized effort,* and finally by physical triumph in terms of control over goods and methods of production. Then does the circle of ruthless means begin to return upon itself. Then arise new besiegers and new defenders of material goods—which merely guarantee the existence of the body.

Need there be any more convincing proof that Kali Yuga is a reality? Who among men fights for *knowledge* as other men fight for land, goods, and organizational power? How many seek security in the only place where it can actually be found—in sufficient self-knowledge to help men find the roots of life in the human and not the animal realms?

Must there be Revolution, a complete change of "systems," *before* it is actually possible to enlighten men in the Wisdom Religion? No, though the degradation of prevailing "systems" gives sufficient reason why so many well-intentioned revolutionaries, socialist and otherwise, have been extremely impatient with Theosophical efforts to right the maladjustments of society by use of principles of philosophy, rather than by organized rebellion against unjust "systems." Completely new *values* must indeed be found, but these must play a *causal* part in social change—and not be expected to arrive with the happy millennium which succeeds "revolution." The Theosophist may in fact be much more revolutionary than the most determined socialist. He wants his revolution to last. And he knows that he cannot but create the necessity for another and later revolution unless the men who "revolt" against unjust conditions of society, revolt against what is *fundamentally* unjust about them—the placing of material security above the security which only spiritual self-knowledge affords.

If people do not learn to prefer to survive in the manner of Socrates, Karma will inevitably decree that they will not survive at all.

With every effort of will toward purification and unity with the "Self-god," the seventh principle, one of the lower rays breaks and the spiritual entity of man is drawn higher and ever higher to the ray that supersedes the first, until, from ray to ray, the inner man is drawn into the one and highest beam of the Parent-SUN.

—H.P.B.

PSYCHIATRY AND THEOSOPHY

THE spectre of insanity looms incredibly large over the inhabitants of all "civilized" countries. A steadily increasing number of psychotics overflow the facilities of our present mental institutions. Before the outbreak of World War II, statistics established the fact that one out of every five hospital beds in the U.S.A. was occupied by a person who was sick because his personality had "split" or given way under the pressures of modern culture. The recent war increased the proportion, for great as were the casualties from bodily wounds, these were far outnumbered by cases of mental damage. Dr. Thomas Parran, Surgeon-General, U.S. Public Health Service, reported last November that some 600,000 hospital beds—more than half of all that are available—are occupied by mental patients, and every year witnesses the admission of a quarter of a million new patients. He estimates that 8,000,000 Americans (over six per cent of the population) "suffer from some sort of mental illness."

"Battle neurosis," psychiatrists have discovered, is often far more complex than a comparatively simple neuro-physiological ailment. While the noise and concussions of war, the sight of violent death, can cause temporary nervous breakdowns, *the serious case of battle neurosis is a man who was already neurotic before he went into action.* Conditions of modern warfare substantially lower resistance to psychoses, but they are a proximate, not an ultimate, cause of mental disorder.

Modern psychiatry owes a great debt to Sigmund Freud, its virtual founder. But psychiatry derived from Freud the unquestioned assumption of the basically animal nature of man—a view which, from any idealistic or dualistic viewpoint, oversimplifies and confuses the actual causes of neuroses. Fortunately, since the need for psychiatric aid has become so great, the field is no longer peopled almost entirely with "Freudians," although Freud's bias of animalism remains in greater or lesser degree with the majority. There are, today, good psychiatrists just as there are good doctors—men and women qualified by temperament and thoughtful study to give successful treatment to sick minds. But who is working on the problem of tracing and eliminating from our culture the central *causes* of neuroses and psychoses? This is the real *social* problem, and like many political and economic difficulties, it cannot be solved unless philosophical rather than purely statistical analysis is employed.

Plato would say that the insane are simply those whose inner confusion has grown to hopeless proportions. He would seek the

cause of insanity in failure to understand correctly the contradictory impulses of two parts of ourselves—the "nous" and the "psyche" (the soul-mind, and the psychic center of animal, sensory intelligence). This is very clearly a manner of explanation habitual to all supporters of Theosophic teaching—that the Ego must subordinate the lower self to its purposes and *understand why this is done,* in order to be completely "sane."

Turning to modern clinical experience, we encounter an apparent contradiction of this view, for most psychiatrists are of the opinion that a feeling of "guilt" on the part of the patient is the greatest single cause of neuroses. There is much evidence to support this position. The tortured religious conscience will drive men to drink, to suicide, or to some desperate crime, and the literature of mental aberration is so full of case histories showing how human beings "snap" under the pressure of religious "guilt" that psychiatrists are largely justified in their conclusion. The obvious treatment, for the modern doctor, is to eliminate this abnormal and disturbing "moral sense," and thereby end the emotional conflict. He would return man to his "natural," uninhibited state—the state, that is, of innocent animalism, free from the emotional gadflies and hair shirts of outraged conscience.

Theosophy opposes this tragic simplification of the human problem by asserting that the conflict between desires and ideals must be recognized and understood, rather than abolished. In the natural tension between the higher and lower nature is the very essence of man's struggle toward a higher life. It is only when the meaning of a "higher life" is so thoroughly misconceived, as in traditional dogmatic religion, that the conflict between desires and ideals is transformed into an irrational competition of rival psychic impulses, ending, finally, in psychic disaster.

It is nonetheless easy to understand why psychiatrists have been led by practical experience to assert the hidden viciousness of the traditional "two-worldism" upon which theological morality has been based, and why they have attacked conventional notions of morality—because they do not want to see people torn apart by holding to "ideals" they cannot practically follow. Actually, the theosophist and the psychiatrist have common ground in the perception that the sort of "two-worldism" which has been our Western heritage is in itself false and neurotic. Theological Christianity insisted upon the doctrine of sin with more perseverance than was evidenced in regard to any other tenet. The doctrine of sin declares that part of ourselves is evil, and that any desire of the sensory man

is a message from the devil. Around this influential belief have grown the various categories of sin, the moral codes and conventions supported by all the vested interests of society which defend the *status quo*. No individual, from a Theosophical standpoint, can take his moral counsel from such a categorical and often deluded source without experiencing something of a personality-split. Ideals should be livable and workable; they should illumine the nature of contradictory desires rather than arbitrarily pronounce them "evil."

The origin of neuroses and psychoses, the psychiatrists report (and quite truly), is *anxiety or fear*. The Christian teaching of two-worldism depended upon fear for its acceptance, for it was a catalogue of evil things and good things, not a philosophy of intelligible principles. The position taken by Church despots, when they felt it necessary to rationalize their position, was that they were the Fathers of a flock, and must, like all parents, force their children to be good. This rationalization will not stand psychiatric analysis. Physical force (educatively useful, perhaps, at times) is quite a different thing from the force of an implanted fear—the favorite tool, apparently, of all priests and other autocratic moralists. There is a distinction to be made between forcing by overt pressure-means and attempting to make the child *fear*. Moralizing unintelligently to children may be much more dangerous than even a physical beating, since if the child is habituated to fear or distrust himself (because he is asked to accept somebody else's values upon threat of some sort of mysterious supernatural punishment), he already has a good basis for a psychosis later in life.

One of the greatest benefits of modern psychiatry is that derived from exorcising the concept of sin, in practical, specific terms, from the sub-conscious life of the patient. Often, the psychiatrists have apparently demonstrated, those things within us which are kept hidden by the pressure exerted by myths of our present social order, are not "bad" but *at least potentially* good. This simple realization, when brought to the attention of a patient by a psychiatrist, is sometimes sufficient to arrest or mitigate a mind-split. But since modern psychiatry refuses to consider the hypothesis that there may be, within the physiological organism, a moral center or soul with a *meta*physical destiny to fulfill, all disinclinations to uninhibited sensual indulgence are proclaimed to be distorted remnants of the old theological sin-complex.

It is at precisely this point that the educative counsels of Theosophy diverge from the usual recommendations of the psychiatrist. If man is a soul, qualitatively independent so far as the desires of

the body are concerned, a mind-split can also be caused by frustration of "higher" desires. If a moral impulse is thwarted by the contemporary lack of idealism, the results may be even more serious than when physiological desires are "feared" and labelled as black sin. Further, the man who is led to adopt a "sensual" rather than a "moral" pattern of life may discover an inner misery which reaches damaging proportions—a misery which can be understood only by positing the internal monitors of conscience and intuition. The fact that theological definitions of conscience and intuition were once accompanied by the sin psychology is beside the point. The soul, psychiatrists must come to learn, *is a reality*. Treatment of psychiatric disorders should be modified and relieved of dogma by making allowance for the "soul," even if it is only a *possibility*.

Despite their lack of "soul," however, some practicing psychiatrists have discovered the need for a better, a more basic morality, than that offered with the pretensions to virtue which overload our hypocritical mores. Dr. Karen Horney's *Neurotic Personality of our Time,* published in 1937, may be referred to as one fairly constructive example of this trend. This book has been widely read, for the type of understanding it helps inaugurate has been increasingly needed. Miss Horney's work is the fruit of a curious, roundabout process—the attempt to find morality through a process of elimination. Such psychiatric "morality" is complementary to John Dewey's labors for "pragmatism" in the field of education.

The perception that the typical characteristics of our culture make it a breeding ground for personal neuroses and psychoses is an important one, as a passage from *Neurotic Personality* will illustrate:

> There are . . . certain definite contradictions in our culture, which underlie the typical neurotic conflicts. It would be the task of the sociologist to study and describe these cultural contradictions. It must suffice for me to indicate briefly and schematically some of the main contradictory tendencies.
>
> The first contradiction to be mentioned is that between competition and success on the one hand, and brotherly love and humility on the other. On the one hand everything is done to spur us toward success, which means that we must be not only assertive but aggressive, able to push others out of the way. On the other hand we are deeply imbued with Christian ideals which declare that it is selfish to want anything for ourselves, that we should be humble, turn the other cheek, be yielding. For this contradiction there are only two solutions within the normal range: to take one of these strivings seriously and discard the other; or to take both seriously with the result that the individual is seriously inhibited in both directions. . . .

> These contradictions embedded in our culture are precisely the conflicts which the neurotic struggles to reconcile: his tendencies toward aggressiveness and his tendencies toward yielding; his excessive demands and his fear of never getting anything; his striving toward self-aggrandizement and his feeling of personal helplessness. The difference from the normal is merely quantitative. While the normal person is able to cope with the difficulties without damage to his personality, in the neurotic all the conflicts are intensified to a degree that makes any satisfactory solution impossible.
>
> It seems that the person who is likely to become neurotic is one who has experienced the culturally determined difficulties in an accentuated form, mostly through the medium of childhood experiences, and who has consequently been unable to solve them, or has solved them only at great cost to his personality. We might call him a stepchild of our culture.

Dr. Horney's book is but one expression of a conscientious effort toward uniting sociology and psychology, and the popular use of terms such as "psychotic" and "neurotic" indicate a gradual sophistication of the public in respect to the prevalence of mental illness ("psycho-neurotic" was a convenient intermediate classification made familiar by military doctors). *Life* magazine recently carried a startling article, complete with pitiful pictures, showing how badly understaffed are our mental institutions—unable to cope with the increasing thousands of new patients. Philip Wylie's vitriolic book, *Generation of Vipers,* bitterly attacks the social mores which produce people of warped and distorted emotional constitutions. Dr. Edward Strecker, in a recent *Saturday Evening Post* article, "What's Wrong with American Mothers?" echoes Mr. Wylie's somewhat extreme thesis in more moderate fashion.

This "trend" of demand that we reconsider contemporary values comes late in the present cycle—very possibly such attempts to "understand" would be *too* late, were no modulus set by Theosophic study for careful re-orientation of both social and individual ideals. It will be the theosophists, whether or no they formally bear that name, who can lead the way to psychological maturity, for a theosophist believes there is a philosophy of Truth around which contradictory impulses and social criteria can be resolved in a pattern possessing meaning for the Soul.

Possibly a few propositions concerning the roots of common neuroses may be outlined, with the further suggestion that mental splits frequently involve distorted ideas of either religion or sex—usually both.

Mental disorders of psychic origin grow from intensified failure to reconcile incompatibilities between what a person wants to do and what he thinks he *ought* to want to do. The "wants" may be anti-social and selfish, but are by no means necessarily so. Conversely, the "oughts" are not necessarily good, since they are often founded upon conceptions of virtue which are themselves traceable to the pernicious idea of a rotten core of "sin" at the center of man's physical being. Psychiatrists know inductively, as theosophists do deductively, that the physical self is in no sense evil. Distorted *minds*—warped by hereditary fears of "sinning"—do, however, exist and are the source of many forms of vicious and neurotic behavior. (The psychic "translation" of this sin superstition is stringently analyzed in Edward Bellamy's tale of the country of the mind-readers—"To Whom This May Come," reprinted in THEOSOPHY XXVI, 398 and 445. Bellamy asserted a central point with vigor—that when people think some things must be kept hidden and unadmitted they will gradually develop tendencies *really* worth hiding.)

The thing that a person thinks he "ought" to do, further, is often conditioned by selfishness—not genuine moral obligation. The grim moralist may simply be trying to buy passage to heaven, or buy a sense of superiority over others—or calm his *fears* as to his destination in the hereafter.

The key to a solution lies in a re-examination of the old ideals which have proved their weakness, and in the establishment of values that are applicable by the individual in question—values which offer broad, suggestive lines along which conduct can be made more intelligent, rather than categorical specifics about "do's" and "don'ts."

Our culture abounds in arbitrary, superficial standards of "moral" behavior. The psycho-neurotic man is a victim of many unintelligent modes of social thinking, and, to recover, must find *better* than "average" ways of thinking in order to pull himself out of a desperately frustrating situation.

The neurotic can best be helped by those who have consciously found philosophical standards in advance of their age or society. The person who wants to know how to help the mentally ill, then, must re-examine his own life-aims (whether consciously or unconsciously held) and be sure he is actually "fearless and unperplexed."

Unless the Ego takes refuge in the Atman, the ALL-SPIRIT, and merges entirely into the essence thereof, the personal Ego may goad it to the bitter end. —H.P.B.

YOUTH-COMPANIONS AT HOME

IT was a quiet family that piled into the car one night for the weekly *Ocean* class at the Lodge. Father, having settled himself expansively in the back seat, leaned toward Mother across a space not usually unoccupied.

"What's the matter with Madge? Is she sick?" he inquired.

Mother shrugged her shoulders. "She doesn't feel too good, perhaps," she began, but Chris would not let her finish:

"Oh, she's not sick. This is the third meeting she's missed in the last two weeks. She just didn't want to come, that's what. She's probably reading an old novel." Chris had only recently begun to come regularly to the meetings himself, and to his youthful enthusiasm may perhaps be ascribed this outburst of righteous indignation. It was not to pass unchallenged, however. Paul finished backing the car out of the long driveway and drew in his head.

"And quite possibly you don't know what you're talking about," he retorted, with a sharp glance at Chris. Paul was adept at making remarks calculated to incense his brother, and, true to form, Chris rose to the occasion and prepared to join battle.

At this point, Mother sighed audibly, and Father laughed in an attempt to ease the situation. "How did we get into *this* argument, anyway?" he wondered, rhetorically.

"Chris seems to consider himself a mind-reader of parts, and I simply question his qualifications," replied Paul, airily, by no means willing to let go the bone of contention.

"Oh, you act so infallible—" Chris ground out, but could say no more, for Father intervened.

"All right. Let's drop it right here, shall we?" A hint of sharpness in his voice made the suggestion more of a command.

Paul braked the car to a stop, and, waiting for the light to change, turned toward the back seat. "I'd rather not drop it, Dad. It's important. —Not the side-issue, but the idea of coming to meetings."

Father reserved judgment. "I've no objection to a *conversation,*" he replied, placing significant emphasis on the last word.

Paul grinned appeasingly at his brother. "May I propose a truce? And then we can go on from there."

"That is as may be," returned Chris, gruffly, salving his wounded pride by withholding immediate reconciliation. "But I still don't think it's right to stay home from a meeting just because you don't especially *feel* like going."

"I *do*," replied Paul, with obvious intent to shock. There were no answering gasps from the others—the Family had learned to

assume an attitude of high indifference at Paul's opening salvos, and this often disconcerted the young "radical." They had long ago discovered that he was usually in harmony with them as to essentials, though something of a budding controversialist.

"I don't see any value in going to the Lodge just as if it were another church," he continued, then. "When a meeting night rolls around, the old habit re-asserts itself, sets off the same old reaction and there you are on your way to the Lodge."

"Well," suggested Father, somewhat on the defensive, "what would you suggest? We can't have a new reason for going to each meeting. And if you have the *same* reason, that means the formation of some kind of habit, don't you think?"

"That's all right for you and Mother, Dad," Paul replied, and was silent for a moment while he maneuvered the heavy car through some thick traffic. "But it's different to be born into a habit."

"It's not only a habit," Chris answered, raising high the banner of the "regulars." "We know the meetings need support. What if everybody just decided they weren't in the mood, and stayed home! That would give newcomers a fine chance to learn about Theosophy, wouldn't it!" It was evident that the responsibility for the Lodge's welfare rested heavily on his young shoulders.

At this point, Paul pulled the car to a stop outside the Hall, and the Family dispersed with tacit agreement to continue the conversation on the way home.

* * * * *

"I'm not advocating that people stay home just because they're not especially in the mood," Paul began, as they settled themselves once more in the car. "But I think in certain circumstances a little such 'pampering' might have some good results."

"Just what *are* you talking about, Paul?" Mother challenged her son's obscurity. "You always take so long to get to the point."

"When you're born into something, you can't help but take it for granted," Paul said earnestly. "You don't question, and it's a short step from that to a rut—Theosophical or otherwise."

"And what would you propose—that everyone stop coming to the Lodge every once in a while in order to keep out of a rut?" scornfully demanded Chris, still not abandoning his offensive.

"I've nothing specific to propose," replied Paul, slowly, and after a quick glance at his brother, he continued, "Say, Chris, didn't you ever notice that at a certain age you began to get conscious of Mother and Dad?—excusin' your presence," he added, with a back-

ward grin at them. "But didn't you begin to think of them as something more than convenient sources of supply, on whom you could depend for help, money, or whatever else it was you needed?"

"Yes, they're growing more human every day!" replied Chris, laughing at the age-old witticism.

"That's just what I mean," said Paul. "And that's what I think has to happen with each of us and Theosophy. Somewhere along the line there's a change in our relationship with it, when we stop taking it for granted and begin really to question and use it."

"You mean that when people come into Theosophy from a religion, or from nothing at all—as your mother and I did—they're in a better position to question it intelligently, to compare it with what they've previously believed,—right?" asked Father.

"Yes," said Paul. "*They* think about it before they come in, and we ought to think about it the same way. We have to get 'on the outside looking in,' somehow, or else we'll be just as complacent about Theosophy as some people are about their religion."

Chris caught the idea. "—Like that question tonight, you mean, about 'when will science realize that Theosophy is the Truth?' " Chris sniffed his disapproval. "Well, Science seems to be getting along all right, but what are *we* doing about Theosophy?"

Paul nodded. "It's not that I think Madge thought of all this and then decided to stay home and 'clarify her position.' I think she's just reached a point where the momentum of the past isn't strong enough to carry her along."

"Well, everyone meets those moments of choice," said Mother, quietly, "when the past is outgrown and we are ready to step consciously into a larger future."

"—And there's no danger that Theosophy will be outgrown in the process," Paul added, "unless the parents, say, mistake the transition for the end and try to *force* the process."

"As if Theosophy were like religions, and had something to fear from people *thinking*!" exclaimed Chris, loftily.

Father gave Paul a thoughtful glance. "This is something we've not had much occasion to think about, you know, because you all seemed 'naturals' for Theosophy. I don't doubt that Madge has been thinking harder of what's been going on at the Lodge tonight than she might have if she'd come!"

Madge's greeting on their return was an unconscious fulfilment of Father's prophecy. "Do you know, I *missed* it," she said slowly. "I guess Theosophy grows larger in perspective," she added with a mysterious air, and Paul nodded. He knew what she meant.

PRACTICAL METAPHYSICS

II: A Beginning For Positive Search

TO find one's place, perhaps, is the only enduring matter of import to anyone. This is a basic human fact, just as it is also true that no one can exist without expressing a "religion" or "philosophy." Many deny the slightest interest in either, usually by affirming that the business of the human animal is simply to concentrate upon enjoying a life of the senses; but, even this becomes a religion.

These statements are self-evident. They are observable factors in the central equation, and must have a meaning, must suggest a certain sure ground for the beginning of a way of thinking that can trust itself. Let anyone search here with open mind and certain conclusions become obvious: First, man, unlike the animal, is consciously aware of the complexity of life, and is not satisfied with a complete relativity of values. He wishes to reduce complexity to simplicity, to an orderly pattern of thought, a unified explanation. He is aware of diversity, knows that other beings exist with ideas and purposes running counter to his own. But he shows himself to be also a believer in unity. He wants to find One explanation for Many things. He demands an absolute value or two.

The desire which leads him to wish for an understanding which includes all he sees when viewing the vastness of the great experiment of life, indicates that he unconsciously assumes that there must be *one* meaning and *one* purpose for all, even though individuals seems to express nothing but their differences. No man ever concluded that his basic philosophy applied only to himself. And the universal manifestation of a belief in some all-inclusive explanation is of itself a thing to be pondered. It is important evidence pointing toward an essential unity amidst diversity. "The mind is urged to ask for one Cause of many effects; then for the cause of that; and again the cause, diving still into the profound; self-assured that it shall arrive at an Absolute and sufficient one; a One that shall be All," said Emerson in his essay on Plato.

To search for *one* meaning in all of life is the quest that each individual is upon when he asks, "Who and what am I? Where am I going? When will I arrive?" There have been moments in the life of every person, no matter how "unphilosophical" he may appear to be, when he ponders these questions. And when he does, he is not satisfied if someone answers, "Everything is relative," for he will further query, "Yes, but relative to what? What am *I* relative to, and *how*?"

If finding, feeling or expressing a relationship toward the *whole* of life is the inevitable task of man, it follows that a conscious awareness of the predicament is the first step toward reconciliation with the human situation. Such awareness, in turn, necessitates a mental effort to clarify the exact nature of the basic outlook being expressed by one's present "way of life." From this point of conscious awareness, it is possible to realize the things not known which need to be known, to become aware, also, of existing inconsistencies in position which must be resolved if a clear understanding is to be reached. And this is the value of philosophical inquiry, which, if denied, denies to man his only sure way of consciously encompassing more than the mechanics of biology.

The first naturally indicated step in this inquiry should be a simple recognition of the presence of the internal demand for a unified philosophical view. We require a perspective capable of reconciling all of the divergent elements of life with ourselves. We already know that man desires to be an "individual," and that in the full expression of what he believes to be his individuality, he achieves a portion of his intuitively-felt destiny. But his capacity to act and react differently from others is only an expression of one part of himself. He also wants to know what he has *in common* with others; else he would not be driven, as he is driven, to belief in a basic view of life which establishes some form of relationship between himself and other beings.

The overwhelming weight of human testimony indicates that a man believes in reciprocal love with fellow humans, fully as much as he believes in the unique qualities he represents as an individual. And while modern philosophical relativists are fond of asserting that love is simply an enlightened self-interest based upon the things that others can do for us if we will do for them, love, as an emotion, is not expressed in this calculating way. Qualities of genuine humanitarianism, tenderness, mercy, seem to be latent in the most hardened of men and often find expression at surprising times. There is much internal evidence that men do not love because of some particular advantage which may accrue to them through the relationship, but simply love because they do love. What is the source of this universal feeling? All humanitarians realize the capacity for its extension. It has often been labeled God; *i. e.*, God is Love. But since love and self-sacrifice have been existent and self-sustaining in ages and civilizations entirely unaware of the concept of a Personal God, they must stem from a source-feeling in no way dependent on the idea of "God." God has been used as a convenient pigeon-hole for

many profound mysteries, and this is but one of them. To use a delimiting symbol for a natural bond uniting all men in interdependence is to make interdependence much more difficult of conscious realization.

Immanuel Kant, one of the most influential of Western philosophers, recognized a capacity to "express interdependence" through love or concern without resorting to the habitual formulas of religion. He *assumed* the capacity of each individual to regard other men as ends in themselves and not simply as means to one's own ends. And upon the same apparently natural assumption have been built all humanitarian hopes. It implies a first principle of religion or philosophy. From the sun-worshippers of Egypt and Persia, through the mysticism of the East and the Platonism of the West, to the simple natural religion of the American Indians, there have been attempts to express a common bond uniting all life and the idea that understanding of oneself cannot be attained without approaching in humility the One Source which is the sustaining essence of all individuality. "Beyond all finite existences and secondary causes, all laws, ideas, and principles, there is *Nous,* the first principle of principles, the Supreme Idea on which all other ideas are grounded; the ultimate substance from which all things derive their being and essence, the first and efficient Cause," wrote Plato. Any belief in the brotherhood of man expresses the idea of a metaphysical oneness underlying all human nature, a common source and origin.

To deny a metaphysical bond between all men is to deny the existence of any quality of human love or concern, except as a sublimation of selfishness, which is to curtly refuse hearing to a great mass of obvious evidence. We can find nothing substantial to support any other ultimate conclusion than that of a metaphysical oneness and are justified in establishing this first principle of philosophy on the ground that it is self-evident, *i. e.,* there is a "uniting bond" between all men and this bond cannot be physical or material, because every physical organism illustrates nothing but diversity. Further, this bond, whether we ascribe it to deity or to a common source, implies a spiritual identity, an identity in essential capacity.

Utilizing these simple, most natural assumptions, we find ourselves in agreement with the underlying roots of all religions, parting company with their theologies, however, when the nature of this One Consciousness is personalized. That a sharp divergence must take place here can be clearly seen. An outward deity, a deity in any lingering sense personal, is an attempted establishment of reality *outside* ourselves, whereas the root of the philosophical task of

"finding one's place" must be in appraising and understanding reality *in* ourselves. As a modern metaphysician, John McTaggart, wrote:

> The self answers to the description of the fundamental differentiations of the Absolute. Nothing else which we know or can imagine does so. The idea of the self has certain characteristics which can be explained if the self is taken as one of the fundamental differentiations, but of which no explanation has been offered on any other theory, except that of rejecting the idea of the self altogether, and sinking into complete scepticism. The self is so paradoxical that we can find no explanation for it, except its absolute reality.
>
> I should agree that God (if you think best to call it God) stands to the selves as the regiment does to the soldiers. But I should not call either God or the regiment a personality. I should not hold that God has any intrinsic value—the only intrinsic value is in the selves, though they only have it because they are united in the Divine Unity.
>
> I conceive the self as like a jet of water. All the more so because fountains spread out as they reach the top. I think of us as a fountain, the culmination of whose efforts is to reach the heights at which they will directly touch one another. Take the selves to be the fundamental differentiations of reality. Each of these differentiations contains in itself the content of the whole, though, of course, not in the same way that the whole itself contains it. Thus if we ask what is contained in each individual differentiation, the answer is Everything.

If this assumption of unity dismisses God as a being, it serves to establish a definition of deity or spirit. The only deity we can know is that which exists as the root of our own existence, and which we can see reflected in all others, sustaining them as it sustains us. What is the individual nature of this "root"? In us there is that which is the spectator of change, yet does not change. There can be no perception of change unless there is a point from which it may be perceived in contrast—to what? To that which is permanent. Tolstoi, in the midst of his philosophical confusion, felt that he saw one thing clearly: "That which unites in one all the scattered states of consciousness, which, in turn, then binds our body in one, is a very definite thing, although independent of conditions of time and place, and is brought into the world by us from the realm of the spaceless and timeless." (Essay on Life.)

There is a power in us to know, to experience, apart from things that are known or experienced. All of these "powers" are manifestations of something every living thing shares—the capacity to become something more than it already is. This power is the power of every being. As it is the root of ourself, it is also the root of All-Self. Remove this and there is no life, no movement, no evolution.

Thus the deity of the man who strives to be a philosopher cannot be less than this root of existence, this infinite principle which is the heart of all selves. In approaching the ultimate mystery of existence, we can go no further with our minds than the recognition of a basic oneness, manifested in each individual as the "power to become." In other ways, through love, through intuition, we can *sense* its Presence. In this latter language the mystics, poets, and religious teachers have spoken to us, and often have come closer to rationality than the academicians, whose intellectualisms have beclouded and complicated their perception. And this same charge of beclouding and confusing the issue must be laid at the door of every organized religion. Fundamental feelings are never expressed if the mind is limited by creedal pattern. Sectarianism demands a conformity which is entirely unnatural to the individual.

That most powerful of Christian organizations, the Roman Catholic Church, accepts the natural feelings of man to reach union with an essence greater than individual self, but distorts its expression by the authoritarian framework surrounding Communion, and in like manner does every religious orthodoxy utilize the emotional aspect of the search for the One in the Many, unity in diversity. Communion is the *religious* heart of Catholicism—and yet, viewed analytically, it is in no way dependent upon the Church as an institution or authority. Its impressiveness as an experience has led many to become uncritical followers of the Mother Church, yet the power on which Communion confusingly feeds, the power of any such religious observance which is intended to bring one "close to God," is in that deepest urge in the heart of man—to realize his oneness with the whole. This is the same source feeling that impels mentally toward a unified explanation of life, the same source-feeling which is expressed directly through love or concern for one's fellows. If, during its examination, we do not feel ourselves near to reality, we can probably never hope to feel such a nearness. For these combined—many facets of one great human fact—are the very roots of our being.

Not a nation, not a people, nor the most abject tribe, but after their own fashion has believed in an Unseen God, the First Cause of unerring and immutable laws, and in the immortality of our spirit. No creed, no false philosophy, no religious exaggerations, could ever destroy that feeling. It must, therefore, be based upon an absolute truth. —H.P.B.

HIDDEN HINTS IN THE SECRET DOCTRINE

(From p. 160 to p. 184, Vol. I.)

By W. Q. J.

MARS AND MERCURY bear an occult relation to the earth which will not be explained. *Vol. I, p. 163.* This is not because no explanation exists, but because, as said *(p. 164, footnote)*, these explanations belong to high grades of initiation.

FIGURES AND NUMBERS the key to the whole system; *I, 164, last line.* This has often been stated. Among the Jewish cabalists it is said that the Universe is built by number, weight, and measure, and that harmony is the law reigning over all. Now if the hint given be true, that figures and numbers *will not* be given for the above reasons, then it is useless for students to bother their minds about the occult meaning of numbers, as so many now do; for this occult meaning cannot be found without assistance.

VENUS IN HER 7TH ROUND. See italicized par. *on p. 165,* where it is said that that planet is in her last round. This must be her 7th. Hence the men there are as gods to us, and, if the argument from analogy is to be relied on, some of her great light must emanate from those beings and not all be from the sun.

MARS WITH TWO MOONS NOT HIS OWN. See *p. 165, ital. par.* This is taken from the letter by a Master who, replying to the query as to why Mercury and Venus have no satellites, says: "It is . . . because Mars has two satellites to which he has no right" and—for other reasons. That is, we infer that Mars absorbed these moons or dragged them off into his orbit at some time enormously distant and still keeps them. They cannot therefore stand to him in the same relation as our moon does to us. One of the "other reasons" may be that, Venus being in her 7th round, all vestiges of old moons have been sublimated and absorbed into her atmosphere.

ESOTERIC METAPHYSICS must be understood. *I, 169, last par.* This rule is laid down by the Adepts and is therefore of greater weight than if formulated by a student. It is useless to attempt to master the system on the lines of modern research, which at best are empirical, very faulty, and leading almost always to a materialization of the whole scheme. Metaphysics deals with the real because the ideal, and physical science with the phenomenal and therefore illusory and changeable.

NOTE.—This article was first printed in *The Path,* May 1891.—Eds. THEOSOPHY.

EVOLUTION OF THE MONAD A BASIC PRINCIPLE. *I, 171, 1st line.* This is laid down with extreme clearness and should not be forgotten. It is not expanded so that inattentive minds may get it through much repetition, but it is postulated once for all. It is still altogether too customary for students to separate the Monads, first from the globes and then from the beings thereon. They cannot be thus divided off. All the globes and their objects are and ever will be monads in stages of evolution, just as we who now study the question are monads ourselves in other stages. The false notion should at once be discarded that there was a time when there were no monads on the globe but that there was here in waiting this ball of earth coming from no one knows where, and that later on monads arrived to occupy it.

If we carry out the principle laid down, then the globe is the creation of the monad; and when the globe is evolved, at once monads needing that experience enter into its corporeality to continue its existence. These later monads are those far behind in the race who will, in some succeeding period of evolution, be in a position to evolve on their own account some new globe in ages yet far distant, for the carrying on of the same process eternally. For, as a material object cannot spring out of nothing, neither can education or knowledge or ability to plan arise out of nothing, but must be based upon and flow from some prior experience or education. So it must be that even now there are monads encased in the mineral, vegetable, and animal kingdoms which have never been farther than that, and will during the remainder of the race evolution continue their education in those lower kingdoms until their time shall come when, the door opening for their exit, they will pass out and higher to make room for others.

LIMIT TO NUMBER OF MONADS. Although there can be no such thing as a metaphysical limit to the monads, yet practically, for the purposes of any one manvantara, there must be a limited number of monads included within its evolutionary sweep. Since a manvantara, however vast and inconceivable by us, is wholly a finite period, it sets its own limit—within the illimitable absolute—for the monads attracted to it. This of necessity must be, since the natural world which makes experience possible, being finite because material, sets the limit by reason of its capacity being bounded. *See 1st par. p. 171.*

THE FATE OF THE ANTHROPOID APES. This interesting question is raised first on *pp. 173 and 175,* and not disposed of. There, in describing the course of the evolution of the monad, it is said that

the laggards will not be men at all in this cycle *save one exception.* On *p. 184, 2nd par.* it seems to be answered. "In this Round . . . the anthropoids destined to die out in this our race when their monads will be liberated and pass into the astral human forms, (or the highest [human] elementals) of the Sixth and Seventh Races, and then into lowest human forms in the Fifth Round. . . ." These descendants of men through union with animals will thus be karmically rewarded in the next round after this, instead of having to wait until another manvantara.

"The Country of the Soul"

There is, as everyone knows, a province of human life—and only upon reflection do we perceive how vast, how boundless is that province—to whose interests and problems the most extensive knowledge or control of nature's machinery affords no entrance, a country upon which the bright sun of science sheds not a ray of light. It is the country of the soul. We have our affections and sympathies, we have loves and friendships, we have hopes and fears and admirations, inmates of a province of real things as broad and deep as the telescopic heavens above our heads. Of these things science never speaks. She sits above the battle and has no share in our joys and sorrows. Of good and evil, freedom and justice, science has nothing to say. The scientific vocabulary does not include such words as beauty or heroism, nobility or charm, resignation or despair, kindness or generosity, character or conduct. Not until you ponder such words do you perceive how narrow and inhuman is the view that omits them, the internal experiences with which our minds are so continuously occupied from the cradle to the grave. . . .

It was a cardinal error to assume that she [science] could make any substantial contribution to the improvement of human nature, or to the elevation and refinement of human character or human conduct. Intoxicated by the conquests of physical nature, we supposed them sufficient for all our needs, and in our exultation forgot the simple truth that man is not merely a reasoning being, that knowledge of nature's ways does not satisfy his heart, nor does a purely intellectual diet feed his moral and spiritual being, his ideals, aims, and aspirations.

—W. Macneile Dixon

EVERYDAY QUESTIONS

On Patanjali's Yoga Aphorisms

In notes on Aphorism 17 (page 4): When "all lower subjects and objects are lost sight of, and nothing remains but the cognition of the self," does it mean a condition in which the will is, or is not, active?

In simple psychological terms, the only inhibition of the will is anxiety or fear. And man's fear is never fear of a *thing,* but simply doubt of his ability to meet the "thing" if it should confront him. Doubt of oneself and fear of oneself are the anxieties of ignorance. No man who faces and knows himself is "afraid." Dissatisfied with his present state he may be, but in such a case dissatisfaction is but a prelude to an invocation of will to correct matters. Death is "feared" when knowledge of the permanence of self is lacking or incomplete. Thus fearlessness is the first quality assigned by Krishna as a requisite of successful discipleship—for only when a man realizes the inexhaustible power of Soul can he fully release the will and attain concentration.

Meditation represents the quality of steadiness in mental and moral states which must be the accompaniment of a will grown strong. The common forms of will are not in *action* during meditation, but they are present in a very vital sense—since their combined potential energies are being reconstituted for newer and more meaningful expression. This *is* the action of Soul, the regeneration and reconstitution of the will.

The full power of Soul resides in the bonds of spiritual interdependence which reach out to and include all living things. All beings are sources of our "individual" strength, though they are such sources only because they are united in "the divine unity"—the One Self, the Universal Will. Thus attention engrossed in failures, doubts and ignorances is but a "hindrance." The will of the adept becomes fully active, because there is no corner of the wide universe where he fears to enter. Will, as the force of Spirit, moves in and from all beings in all states and conditions. But will, in the individual, is often sundered, disparted, while it can be *integral* and concentrated.

Aphorism 21 (page 10): "The attainment of abstract meditation is speedy, in the case of the hotly impetuous." It does not seem natural that the "hotly impetuous" would be capable of attaining the state of abstract meditation. Why should not a calmer, steadier nature be better fitted to attain that state?

Use of the term "hotly impetuous" would seem to first remind students that nothing is accomplished without passion. The fact that there are many kinds and qualities of "passions" is only to say that even a Buddha had first to *desire* to move toward universal understanding. The kingdom of heaven is always taken by violence, for there comes a time in the psychological life of every man when he must throw all trivial cautions to the seven winds. Yet it is necessary to remind ourselves that Patanjali is not implying that the person who is hotly impetuous *in his relations to others* can reach "abstract meditation." He is the man "hotly impetuous" in respect to his own inner battle. To others, gentleness, calmness—to oneself, fire and steel.

Yet even when the state of abstract meditation is attained, this state is but a field for future action, a condition of mind which can be used wisely or not depending upon the degree of maturity of the being who has reached that state. The state of meditation differs for each individual according to *why* he has sought to reach it. If the "hotly impetuous" one desires the state as an acquisition, for instance, he will *never* attain it fully. If he desires it because he wishes to realize inner potentialities for the benefit of others as well as himself, his impetuousness may be simply a disinclination to be held forever in bondage to the energies of Kama.

Aphorism 17: Just how or what would be the thoughts of one who is pondering on the highest powers of the mind "together with truth in the abstract"?

The "highest powers of the mind" provide the soul with the *metaphysical* "contours" of relationships with other selves. The mind, when limited to functioning directly through the physical brain, can never directly perceive relationships between beings, since its sight is limited to the *material effects* of relationships and fails to illumine the fundamental *nature* of the beings involved.

"Truth in the abstract" might be regarded as representing the spiritual relationships between beings. The truth becomes constantly more "abstract," but at the same time, more "real," with each new awakening to enlightenment, since in the final analysis—which is reduction of all to One Spirit—beings are not "related" at all, but identical in Atma. Therefore the highest faculties of mind begin operation from a Buddhic perception of the One, and proceed downward in consideration of the other "principles"—which comprise the "differences" between individual beings. The highest use

of the mind proceeds, then, from this *deductive* basis, the *inductive* operation of intellectual faculties serving in proper balance only when the One Self of all creatures is the internal point of departure for all reasoning. The favoring of "deductive" reasoning, however, is a dangerous doctrine in an age corrupted by the acceptance of specific dogmas, unless it be made clear that there is only one basis which can be trusted for deductive use of the mind—the basis of an all-pervasive metaphysical unity in spirit.

Aphorism 50: Would worry be considered self-reproductive thought in the sense of Aphorism 50, and also what about the endless going over of past actions, usually to try to find justification for the acts performed? Would not this be analogous to a kamalokic condition, except that one meditating thus would have the chance to "pull out" of the state, whereas in kamaloka the initial energy has to be exhausted there, the will being inactive?

Worry is not *genuinely* self-reproductive, for it is always sustained by fear of the encroachment of *external* factors. Self-reproductive thought is *inner* generation. Self-reproductive thought, in the sense of this aphorism, means *spiritual ideas,* constantly generating and regenerating themselves from the inexhaustible reservoir of Universal Will, located in all that which is informed by Spirit. Kama-loka is only apparently a fully subjective state. Actually it has been produced from former concerns about external things—all those things less than spirit and soul. Its substance—that is, its apparent reality—is simply the inevitable crystallization into semi-substantial form of ideas based on incorrect cognition. Kamaloka is no more self-reproductive than is an astral or physical corpse. It is possessed of *residual* energy, not creative energy, and will pass out of existence as soon as the magnetic currents which are its substratum lose their momentum.

What is to learn, is to be content, or, rather, resigned to ourselves and our limitations even while striving to get above them; and when a bold and loyal nature achieves that knowledge, a great advance is made. The greatest error in occultism is to doubt one's self, for it leads to all doubt. The doubts of others, which we have, always spring from the inward doubt of self. Do not doubt, then, even so much as you admit, in yourself. —W.Q.J.

ON THE LOOKOUT

"Apes, Giants, and Man"

This small volume of little more than 100 pages, by Franz Weidenreich, marks a new milestone in the progress of modern anthropology. It is a book which serious students of Theosophy should read, mark, learn and inwardly digest, for Dr. Weidenreich is a serious, industrious and honest scientist and an intuitive one as well. A grasp of what is in this book will enable students of Theosophy to know fairly well what "science says" about the origin of the human species, and what it does not. In the first chapter, he begins by quoting the view of Thomas Huxley on the evolutionary relationships of man and ape. Huxley wrote:

> Whatever system of organs may be studied, the comparison of their modifications in the ape series leads to one and the same result—that the structural differences which separate man from the gorilla and chimpanzee are not as great as those which separate the gorilla from the lower apes.

From this point of departure, Weidenreich develops his own thesis, which incidentally involves effective criticism of previous scientific ideas. When the ape-origin theory was first presented, he says, all the emphasis was on *similarities* between apes and men, with differences tending to be overlooked. Dr. Weidenreich spends many pages in describing and picturing these differences. He opposes the idea of any close connection between the anthropoid apes and man, observing that additional anatomical facts—he discusses little else—"have made it more and more likely that the three living anthropoids are diverging branches of an anthropoid stem which deviated as such from the same main stock, of which man represents another line." In other words, apes as apes, and man as man, are distinctly separate lines of evolution. Dr. Weidenreich returns repeatedly to the distortions and misinterpretations of the paleontological record by scientists eager to prove a close connection between the great apes and man. Going over these mistakes, and emphasizing the independence of the human line of evolution, he says: "In other words, the evolution of that primate branch which we call 'man' must have begun much earlier than we ever dreamed."

Yesterday's "Science"

Dr. Weidenreich notices the marked difference between the length of the leg-bones of man and those of the ape, indicating a naturally erect position for man; he notes, too, that in a drawing by Thomas Huxley, comparing the skeletons of anthropoids with man, the great

champion of Darwin has pictured the apes artificially erect, while the human skeleton is unnaturally stooped—a bit of persuasive "scientific" misrepresentation to help the gentle reader to believe the Darwinian hypothesis. The ancestors of man, says Dr. Weidenreich, stood erect and walked "long before the three anthropoids could have a claim to their present names." A particular value of his book is his brief and unemotional reference, devastating in effect, to special pleading for the ape theory by scientists of past generations. This does not mean that Weidenreich is himself committed to any startling doctrine of spiritual evolution. He is convinced, like most other anthropologists, that man is an animal, and that human evolution stems from some common source which also produced the apes, but he is at great pains to present the evidence honestly, without polemics or partisan purpose.

Ancient Fossils and Modern Man

Dr. Weidenreich attempts to trace a connection between the remains of ancient species unearthed by research and the present races of man. Although evidence for continuity between modern European races and the paleolithic Neanderthals is entirely lacking, he is certain that the half-Neanderthal type found in the caves of Mount Carmel in Palestine was ancestor to living men. He believes also that there is a line of descent from the Javanese Pithecanthropus to the modern Australian bushman, and that ancient "Rhodesian man can be linked with living southern African racial groups." It cannot be stated, however, that Dr. Weidenreich has shown any clear link between the higher living races and the several ape-like species to which his book is devoted.

Ancient "Giants" of China and Java

The intriguing word "Giants" in his title is to be explained by the fact that the most ancient remains that have been studied by Dr. Weidenreich, and his colleague, Ralph von Koenigswald, are fragments of enormous skeletons, the oldest of all belonging to a creature that was perhaps twice the size of a modern gorilla. (This part of his book is briefly summarized in *Life* for Oct. 7, 1946.) Such giant forms are postulated from the discovery of very large teeth in China and Java. Study of these remains in connection with the skull of the Pithecanthropus unearthed by Dubois years ago causes Weidenreich to announce:

> I believe that all these forms have to be ranged in the human line and that the human line leads to giants, the farther back it is traced.

> In other words, the giants may be directly ancestral to man. This conclusion is based on the facts (1) that giantism is combined with massiveness, and the massiveness decreases in accordance with the size; and (2) that human fossil types with large dimensions and very massive bones may sometimes also occur in later stages. . . .
>
> A question difficult to answer in the present stage of our knowledge is whether the human line led only to giants or whether there were also small forms among them, as is the case in man today . . . . it may be that the giants are only variations—whether local or more widely spread remains, as yet, undecided.

"Facts Were Disregarded"

Other statements of interest in Dr. Weidenreich's book indicate striking differences between the cranial and facial bones of Pithecanthropus and those of modern man; refer to fossil remains with mixed features of both anthropoid and man; and note that the present apes possess, "in principle, the same blood groups as man." A final quotation, illustrating how anthropological theory is too much governed by preconception, deals with an early attempt to derive mankind from dwarf ancestors:

> . . . at the time that the pygmy theory was proclaimed, it could not be supported by any paleontological data. On the contrary, the only really early human form known at that time, Dubois's Pithecanthropus, had no dwarfish proportions but was considered as an especially tall type. For exactly this reason the main propagandist of the dwarf theory, the anatomist J. Kallmann, excluded Pithecanthropus from the human ancestry and pushed him to a side branch, supposed to have died out long before human evolution set in. This is a striking example of the extent to which paleontological facts were disregarded and replaced with purely speculative constructions when evolution of man was the topic and when facts did not agree with preconceived ideas.

Those desirous of reading this book in the light of a more general scientific perspective should acquaint themselves with an important article by Henry Fairfield Osborne, which appeared in *Science,* May 20, 1927. Discussion of Osborne's ideas, and various anthropological discoveries and doctrines, are treated in detail in former volumes of this Magazine: See XVII, 63; XXV, 328-29; XXVI, 324-27, 373-79, 426-27, 559-62, 574; XXVII, 67, 110; XXVIII, 281-84 (pertinent *Secret Doctrine* commentary is cited in most of these discussions).

"The Universe Is Full of Cycles"

This abrupt though indubitably true statement begins an article on "Cycles" in *Life* for Oct. 14. It is as though a *Life* editor had been called upon the repeat "in his own words," the second funda-

mental proposition of *The Secret Doctrine,* and answered in two creditable paragraphs, giving even the importance of understanding the cyclical processes of nature—to "enable mankind to brace itself to meet difficulties which seem inevitable." Lacking, of course, is the part played by the human will in establishing the rule of periodic influences on the race; and there is no hint of the metaphysical view of cycles, involving the migrations of spiritual intelligences as the cause of great cycles of evolution, planetary and racial. Modern studies of cycles are almost exclusively devoted to effects, and the effects of effects, such as the compilation of statistics dealing with "human mental activity, animal mortality or the disintegration of radioactive materials." According to *Life,* "Some scholars even go so far as to credit man with little control over his destiny, placing him completely at the mercy of thousands of impersonal and unsuspected rhythms." Such conclusions make the great need for the Theosophical teaching on cycles readily apparent.

ENVIRONMENT OF FREEDOM

This attack on the doctrine of free-will had its parallel during H.P.B.'s lifetime in the psychological theories reviewed in her article "Psychic and Noëtic Action" (THEOSOPHY XXVIII, 213). The postulate, then, was that "psychic action is found subject to the general and immutable laws of motion," and "there is, therefore, *no free will in man.*" The modern version, referred to by *Life,* is that a multitude of subtle cycles affect our conduct without our knowing it, and that, constrained by these forces, we have only the illusion of free action, but not its substance. Actually, the only true freedom that man *can* have lies in knowledge of these cycles, and the making of choices which take their influence into account. Theosophy has never denied the network of psycho-physical suggestion which forms the real environment of human choice. The study of the seven principles has the practical object of exposing that environment to the reflective intelligence of the chooser; and the end of the discipline taught by Patanjali is the control of those principles and the elimination from human life of every *involuntary* response to psychic influences bearing on moral decision.

HISTORICAL CYCLES

Another phase of the *Life* article deals with large-scale historical cycles. An impressive chart displays the correlations between climatic changes and social revolutions over 2,550 years. Data for this graph were collected by Prof. Raymond H. Wheeler of the

University of Kansas, whose theory of the influence of weather on social conditions is quoted at length in Lookout (THEOSOPHY XXIX, 376-78). The *Life* diagram shows some 25 peaks of cold-dry weather, spaced approximately 100 years apart, and lists social uprisings which concurred with these peaks. The 100-year cycles seem to operate within a great cycle of 510 years, the latter in still larger periods of 1,020 years. According to Prof. Wheeler, the world is now approaching the time when the peaks of several such cycles will intersect, and when, therefore, both cold weather and social unrest will be extreme. In the diagram, this climax is placed at about 2000 A.D. (Students interested in compilations of this sort should re-read H.P.B.'s article, "The Theory of Cycles.")

WEATHER CYCLES

The sun-spot cycles have been the subject of Lookout references on many occasions. The 11-year cycle obviously has climatic significance, if only for the reason that, the sun being the chief physical cause of the weather, it is not unreasonable to suppose that weather cycles should be related to the sun's condition at any given time. An increase in the number of sun-spots generally implies an addition to solar radiation. Although Sir Napier Shaw, a famous meteorologist, tabulated some 130 cycles, ranging from fourteen months to two hundred and sixty years, it is on the basis of the short eleven-year cycle that a forecast has been made (according to the authors of *The Weather,* Pelican Books, 1943) of great droughts likely to occur in the United States in 1975.

At the same time, it is very doubtful if any meteorologist will commit himself to a detailed prophecy for more than 48 hours and for more than a limited area. Indeed, in the course of the recent war, an enormous amount of time, energy, and money, were spent in an effort to ensure weather planning for high military, naval, and air commands. But, "the mountain laboured and brought forth only a mouse"! The collaborating scientists felt that Nature was reluctant to deliver up her weather secrets. They began to feel the force of the remark made by Sir Arthur Eddington before his death in 1944, to the effect that "there can be no fully deterministic control of inorganic phenomena unless the determinism governs mind itself."

MAN AND THE WEATHER

If the fall of dice can be influenced by the mental states of certain individuals, as Mr. Aldous Huxley in *The Perennial*

Philosophy (1946) points out has been established by psychokinesis experiments, there should be no insuperable objection to the proposition that the weather responds to mass thought. It is an age-old belief, at least among non-Christian peoples, although Science has always been sceptical even about axial changes:—

> . . . being unable to account for them, [science] is prepared rather to deny the axial phenomena altogether, than admit the intelligent Karmic hand and law which alone could reasonably explain such sudden changes and their results (*S.D.* II, 329).

Humanity is an integral factor in the processes of Karma, and when it is remembered, also, that "not only is man ruled by these laws [Karma and Reincarnation], but every atom of matter as well," and that "the mass of matter is constantly undergoing a change at the same time with man," it is easy to see the rationale of many weather "superstitions."

MIND AND ATOMIC BEHAVIOUR

Mr. E. L. Hawke, Secretary of the Royal Meteorological Society (England), in an article in the Bristol *Evening Post* (Sept. 20, 1946), quotes the late Sir Arthur Eddington as saying, in a published lecture, that to predict successfully the state of the weather twelve months in advance, "we must penetrate into the recesses of the human mind. A coal strike, a great war, may directly change the atmosphere; a lighted match idly thrown away may cause deforestation which will change the rainfall and climate." As a footnote to this contention, Mr. Hawke reminds us that the weather in and around Tokio for at least three days after the great earthquake of September 1, 1923, was completely chaotic. It is not inconceivable that feelings and thoughts of fear and hatred, also working within the wide sweep of Karmic law, might be contributory factors in the causation of national calamities, including climatic changes, directly or indirectly. In support of this view, we have another of Eddington's conclusions:

> It seems that we must attribute to the mind, power not only to decide the behaviour of atoms individually but to affect systematically large groups—in fact, to tamper with the odds on atomic behaviour.

On this, Mr. Hawke remarks that the earth's atmosphere, in common with all other material things, is built up of atoms, and, if the great scientist was right, we may conclude that our collective thoughts and emotions do influence the weather in some measure. "Until we can foresee history," he adds, "we shall never be able to make sure of predicting the weather accurately for any long period ahead." In this respect, at any rate, the ship of

Occultism, with its doctrine of cycles, and man's influence upon evolution under the Law of Karma, sails with favourable winds!

Docility Can Be Dangerous

A United Press dispatch for Nov. 13 carried some radical remarks on the possible dangers of conformity from Morton A. Seidenfeld, director of psychological services for the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis. Seidenfeld stated that the docile student who causes the teacher no trouble may be severely maladjusted, and that "orderliness, politeness, participation in prescribed activities and freedom from overt misbehavior are all too often regarded as evidence of good adjustment."

Such statements as these represent a further, and very necessary, step in the application of psychiatric principles to problems of education. The first impacts of psychiatric science upon grammar and high school education were accompanied by the adoption of glib and superficial judgments—teachers began to speak about "well-adjusted" and "maladjusted" children instead of "good" or "bad" pupils, but seemed little concerned about just what sort of values the children were "adjusting" or "maladjusting" to. Possibly the spectacle of German and Russian school training brought many teachers to the belated realization that "perfect adjustment" was not in itself a thing to be desired.

The Search For Values

Contemporaneously, the open-minded, probing disciples of John Dewey's Progressive school of educational thought were gnawing at the complacent belief that the *accepted* was equivalent to the good. The question has now become, for more and more practical educators, "What values are good?" rather than "How to be 'good'?" in terms of becoming like everyone else, and winning powerful friends.

While it is obviously possible for a human being to *temporarily* accept any sort of values, the cumulative failure on the part of those values to fill the real needs of the total human being will eventually cause tensions and abortive behavior. The values of our own culture are almost completely inverted—from any standpoint which regards man as responsible soul rather than irresponsible body. Thus a hidden source for generation of psychoses and neuroses is always with us. There is ground for maintaining, as does the radical journalist Milton Mayer, that children should be brought up to be thoroughly *maladjusted* to the accepted cultural standards.

WHY WE NEED PSYCHIATRISTS

The President of Brooklyn College, Dr. H. D. Gideonse, addressing members of the National Committee for Mental Hygiene recently, appealed to psychologists to turn their attention to the psychiatric problems of modern education (New York *Herald Tribune,* Nov. 1). Stating that the psychiatric dangers lurking in the general social and economic pattern in which youth lives are too great a problem for teachers, he remarked that psychiatrists were concerning themselves "with the saloon decorations on a steamer that has a hole in her bottom." The *Tribune* report continues:

> The hole, he said, was their failure to practice preventive psychiatry by exposing and attacking the basic common problems of American youth instead of waiting for the appearance of patients with psychotic symptoms. . . . He ended with a plea to the psychiatrists to forgo the temptation to exploit "the Park Avenue trade in what you might call autobiographical recitations in vacuo," and to accept the less profitable job of explaining to the American people the true sources of tensions which begin in youth. . . .
>
> He listed as the most potent influences the radio, motion pictures, "overall advertising with its very clever appeals" and the general social and economic pattern in which youth lives.

DIM EDUCATORS AND FOGGY CULTURE

While Dr. Gideonse's criticism of some psychiatrists for plying the wealthy Park Avenue trade is justifiable, he perhaps forgets that the moment an honest psychiatrist *really* begins to publicly analyze the roots of neuroticism in our culture he signs his own "death warrant." How would Dr. Gideonse himself, for instance, like the job of asserting that the Christian conceptions of sin and "virtues," the idea of an anthropomorphic deity, the idea of personal salvation through external media, are themselves neurotic? Dr. Albert Einstein once courageously stated the above in respect to the God idea alone, and was immediately ostrasized by the Conference on Science, Philosophy and Religion (see Lookout, THEOSOPHY XXX, p. 131).

One reason, possibly, why Dr. Gideonse calls for outside help in the abolition of neurotic roots in our culture is because he is not prepared to become an unpopular rebel, though this is not presently a warrantable character judgment for the very reason that his conclusions are too vague to provide the reader with any clear idea of what Dr. Gideonse considers to be neuroticism. He states, for example, that the "stereotyped concepts of family, church and school" do not appreciably influence youth. Educators need, perhaps, to realize

more clearly, as some psychiatrists are beginning to do (see "Psychiatry and Theosophy," elsewhere in this issue), that it is precisely the effects of some of these "stereotyped concepts" which encourage many personality-splits.

Democratic Action

Denmark—scene of what has been called the only successful experiment in mass education in the West, the Danish Folk Schools—is today providing her European neighbors with an equally extraordinary object-lesson in democracy. The patient, thrifty and frugal Danes, after suffering the Nazi yoke throughout the war years, are now devoting almost a third of their entire national budget to caring for some 200,000 homeless German refugees who fled before the oncoming Soviet armies in the spring of 1945. These Germans of Danzig and East Prussia—half of them women and 75,000 children—were loaded on ships by officials and told their destination was western Germany, but they were landed in Denmark. There, G. R. Wilson relates (in the New York *Herald Tribune* for Oct. 19, 1946), "schools, hotels, clubs and industrial buildings were confiscated to house the pitiful throng." At this time Denmark was still under Nazi control.

Education For All

When German troops withdrew from Denmark, the refugees were relocated by the Danes in other areas, mostly great deserted air fields built by the Nazis during the occupation. Mr. Wilson visited one such spot—there are 120 in all—at the abandoned Klevermarken airport outside of Copenhagen, where 18,000 German refugees are sheltered, clothed and fed, pending some other arrangement for their care. Here, says the *Herald Tribune* writer,

> are housed more than 9,000 women, 5,000 children and 3,000 old men and boys. Infant kindergartens keep school twenty hours a week, secondary schools thirty-two hours. Adult education is conducted in night schools and manual training is included in all branches of education. Bookbinding, shoemaking, basket weaving, metal work, woodwork, structural design and toy making were some of the manual arts I saw being taught. Adult refugees man the central kitchen, staff the tailor shops which patch and remake old garments and shoes, keep records in a central office, nurse in the hospitals and keep the camp clean. Everyone is at work and happily so, or as happily as refugees can be. At least there has not been a single suicide among the 200,000 since Denmark organized the camps and that in itself tells an eloquent story. . . .

> Probably the most remarkable feature of the refugee camps is that they are supervised by members of the former Danish underground, many of whom suffered bitterly from starvation and torture in German internment camps. In charge of Klevermarken is thirty-five-year-old Harold Sorensen, once condemned to death by the Germans and for two years a cat-eating skeleton in a German camp. His deputy is thirty-year-old Viggo Nielson, another famous underground Dane, and every member of the staff has a history of suffering under Hitler's Gestapo. Yet, when these men appeared anywhere through the camp, it was to have children tugging at their coat tails, old men tipping their hats with broad smiles and women calling their gutteral greetings.

PRACTICAL RELIGION

Carl Raloff, once a member of the German Reichstag, who escaped from the Nazis before the war, is Chief of Democratic Education at the Klevermarken camp. Asked if he thought it possible to teach democracy to these 200,000 Germans, his answer was vigorously affirmative. He told the reporter:

> The Danes are doing it the right way. All these people know how Sorensen and these others suffered, and yet they are doing everything in their power to ease life for the people who so terribly mistreated both them and their nation. . . .
>
> When these children were first brought to the camps they played at soldier. Every stick was a gun, every bit of cloth a gas mask, every game a goose-stepping routine. They talked of Stukas and tanks and flammenwerfers and strutted and struck with childish ferocity. Look at them now. Except for their weak hearts due to shock and the prevalence of tuberculosis due to former malnutrition, they are as normal as children anywhere on earth.

Wilson looked, and found them "busy with drawing flowers, birds, trees, animals and the like . . . the little towheads might have been any similar group anywhere in a democratic country." Visiting Sorenson, Wilson asked him why everyone in the camp, both refugees and attendants, spoke so frequently of democracy. The director replied:

> They have seen totalitarianism. I have felt the opposite of democracy in my body, in my mind, in my soul. With everything in me I hate the thought that all men cannot be free human beings. Every man, woman and child shall have their chance as far as it is in my weak power to give it to them.

Wilson concludes his report with the observation: "I talked religion to none in Denmark. Each camp was a cathedral more imposing than any pile of stone I have ever seen."